

## REMARKS

Claim 17 calls for a base having an upper surface and an ornamental insert covering a portion of the upper surface. A faceplate is coupled to the base, the faceplate "covering all of the upper surface of the base" and the faceplate having a substantially transparent section.

Neither cited reference nor their combination teaches the claimed invention. Namely, neither reference shows a faceplate covering all of the upper surface of the base. Instead, in each case, the faceplates in the cited references cover only a portion of the surface, leaving a substantial portion uncovered.

With the claimed invention, covering the entire surface, in effect, a totally new look may be provided to the device in a very simple way. The user can camouflage or transform his or her electronic device very simply and effectively.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 17 is requested.

Claim 1 is generally similar to claim 17, but calls for "covering substantially all of the first surface." The difference between "all" and "substantially all" must necessarily be that an insignificant portion of the surface is not covered as claimed in claim 1. The case law supports this definition of substantially all. For example, attached are two highlighted cases that found that substantially all means all but an insignificant part. Clearly under such a definition none of the cited references meet the claimed limitation.

In each cited reference, a substantial portion of the surface remains uncovered. Referring to the Chen patent, the device is about 3-½ inches long as depicted and the asserted faceplate is only about two inches. So, roughly, about one-third of the surface remains uncovered by a faceplate. This cannot constitute covering substantially all of the surface.

The German patent is similar in that the faceplate covers approximately half of the surface, leaving a substantial portion uncovered.

Thus, on the analysis described above, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 calls for a digital audio player. It includes the limitation of covering substantially all of the first surface. For the reasons set forth above, claim 9 also patentably distinguishes. Moreover, neither reference teaches a digital audio player.

On a similar analysis, the method claim 12 also patentably distinguishes over the cited art. It calls for manufacturing a removable faceplate to couple to the base and "to cover substantially all of the first surface."

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]